Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC Document 154 Filed 12/02/22 Page 3 of 16 PageID #: 807

And let me hear from the government as to the status.

MR. HEEREN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

We are proceeding as planned to trial in the end of January of 2023.

In terms of the discovery, the government has -- we believe we've largely completed discovery. There are a few small items related to the victims that we expect to be turning over within the next month.

There is an ongoing investigation, so we will maintain sort of our vigor in reviewing materials, and if anything else is discoverable we'll, of course, turn over promptly.

But we got out a substantial production in May of this year that I think turned over the last of the significant items, as well as responded to a request from one of the counsel over there.

Beyond that, and beyond the pretrial motions and stuff, the government has nothing more at this time.

THE COURT: Okay.

I should note that, as everyone knows, there is a pending proceeding related to CIPA materials. And as the parties know, because I've met with various different parties so far regarding that application, I will make a decision on that in fairly due course.

PROCEEDINGS

So I will be ruling on that motion pretty soon, after I have one more meeting that's been scheduled with one of the defendants' counsels.

Regarding the trial date, we are going to have to move it back.

As the parties are aware, because of the pandemic, there is a backlog of trials throughout the courthouse, and we've had to adopt a court-wide calendaring system or a master calendaring system.

That's partially responsible for my having to move other trials. I have back-to-back trials starting from a couple of weeks from now through January. And I had to move a fairly large trial relating to defendants in the FIFA prosecution to January.

And I won't bore you with the reasons about why that happened. But unfortunately that's a five-week trial that I had to slot into January. That was the soonest date I could get all the parties and myself on the same schedule.

The effect of that, of course, is that the trial in this case has to be moved back.

In looking at my trial schedule largely, and the overall, I guess, court schedule, the master calendar, the date -- the earliest date that we could come up with is May --

Fida, tell me the date?

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: 27th.

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Well, obviously I trust the government, or I trust your estimate more than mine. But I would think actually three weeks should be enough but, again, I don't know all the ins and outs of the case.

But from my vantage point, I think we can get this trial done in three weeks, however, it never makes sense to underestimate, because everyone has to clear their calendars.

I think we could start, however, the week of the 22nd, even if we don't sit, for example, on that Friday, because that's the Friday before Memorial Day.

(Discussion was had off the record.)

THE COURT: So we're going to schedule it to start on the 22nd, two-two, of May, anticipating that we won't sit on that Friday, nor the following Monday, which are Memorial Day -- is the Memorial Day weekend, effectively.

Now I'm open to hearing if you think maybe we should just try to avoid that holiday all together, because it may make it more difficult to find a jury or pick a jury.

We could start right after the Memorial Day weekend, on that Tuesday. I don't know if anyone has any thoughts on that one way or the other. It might be the safer bet, quite honestly, so that we just avoid the holiday all together or losing jurors.

(Indiscernible.)

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Can you please use the

alternates -- I forget how many we had decided on before, probably six, I'm guessing, for a trial of this length.

So once again we'll plan on six alternates. And I suspect, if I didn't, I'll come up with a formula, to give a proportionally increased number of peremptory challenges to the defense and then to the government.

I think in past trials where I've had three defendants, for example, I've raised the number of peremptories to I think 15 on the defense side and maybe 15 -- I forget what it is, it's like a two-thirds increase or a one-third increase, but I'll come up with something, to allow for more challenges on both sides.

And then otherwise we'll adjust the rest of the pretrial schedule with respect to proposed *voir dire* and requests to charge, as well as *in limine* motions.

We obviously have a lot of time to work with now for all of those things to be addressed in advance of trial.

Going back to what I started to say was that some of the factors that are considered court-wide, as well as on my own docket, with respect to prioritizing trials, have to do the age of the case, as well as whether the defendants are in custody or not. So obviously there's a priority for trials involving defendants who are in custody.

This case also happens to be newer, or more recently indicted than my other cases that I have on my docket ready

PROCEEDINGS

for trial, and so that's why we're pushing this trial back a few months to accommodate all the other trials that I have to get done, and the overall court-wide schedule.

Is there anything that the defense would like to address at this time?

MR. LUSTBERG: Judge, just very briefly. Lawrence S. Lustberg on behalf of Mr. McMahon.

Two things. First, I agree with Mr. Heeren that we have received all the discovery. The government's been very cooperative.

We -- I alerted Mr. Heeren to an issue regarding some *Brady* material that we'll follow up on, that may or may not bear fruit, but we're continuing to work cooperatively together with regard to that.

We do have a motion that we anticipate filing, Your Honor, that would require a hearing with regard to -- I don't want to overstate it, but potential issues of prosecutorial misconduct having to do with Ms. Zheng Congving.

Mr. McMahon is a defendant. I believe we previewed this a bit for the Court during our ex parte session. We're open to -- obviously we have a lot of time now, but we would be prepared to file that. I'm sure the government will oppose it.

We -- we're prepared to file that within 45 days or so, so it think that would be helpful to the Court, but I also

11

1 don't want to interfere on peoples, you know, summer 2 vacations, given that we have so much time. 3 So that I just wanted the Court to know is coming, 4 and I've alerted the government just this morning as well. 5 THE COURT: All right. I think 45 days for filing 6 the motion should be fine. And I prefer to deal with such a 7 potentially momentous decision earlier rather than later for 8 everyone's sake, especially your clients. 9 So 45 days from now roughly is? 10 MR. LUSTBERG: July, it would be the 28th. THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: July 28th. 11 12 THE COURT: Well done. 13 I'll give the government the same amount of time, if 14 only to get over the summer period, so they can respond in 15 September. I think that should take us to about 16 mid-September. 17 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: September 12th. 18 THE COURT: Why don't we add another week, just to 19 make sure that the government doesn't -- or that the somewhat 20 unexpected motion doesn't interrupt any travel plans or summer 21 holiday plans. 22 MR. HEEREN: Your Honor, that sounds fine. 23 actually don't think it will interrupt holiday plans. 24 Ms. Sise and I are both on trial in the beginning of 25 September.

12

1 I think that that deadline is fine. I just noted if 2 the motion -- if the response ends up being more complex than 3 we anticipated, we'll notify the Court, since we have a bit 4 more time. 5 It seems like something, at least in the first instance, I anticipate we're going to say there's no need for 6 7 a hearing, there's nothing there. But if there's more to it, 8 we'll notify the Court and seek leave for more time, given our 9 schedule. 10 THE COURT: All right. MR. LUSTBERG: And, Judge, we'll obviously be 11 12 flexible in consenting to whatever the government needs. 13 We would like the opportunity, depending on the 14 government's response, to actually file a reply brief. 15 THE COURT: Right, I was going to schedule two weeks 16 for the reply. 17 MR. LUSTBERG: That's fine, Judge. 18 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: September 26th. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Heeren and Ms. Sise, are you in 20 trial together? MR. HEEREN: No, I'm on the Barrack trial before 21 22 Judge Cogan, and Ms. Sise is before Judge Amon on a terrorism 23 trial. 24 THE COURT: All right. Well, things are picking up 25 indeed in terms of trial.

Case 1:21-cr-00265-PKC Document 154 Filed 12/02/22 Page 13 of 16 PageID #: 817

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: 29th is a Friday, the 30th is -- I'm sorry, we're in 2022. You're right.

So May 1st.

24

15

1 Okay. You know, let's do one thing. THE COURT: 2 Let's move it back one week. I want to make sure we have 3 enough time to get these done. 4 So let's go into April. 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: April 24th. THE COURT: Okav. So let's make the motions 6 7 themselves due April 24. Both sides will have two weeks to 8 respond. And that will give --9 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Mav 8th. 10 THE COURT: -- me enough time to try to resolve 11 them, perhaps even before I see you at the final pretrial 12 conference. That would be ideal. 13 Fida, let's just set a final pretrial conference. 14 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: 15 Final pretrial conference date, May 23 at 10 a.m. 16 THE COURT: And then I guess while we're all 17 together, why don't I just set the date for the filing of the 18 requested charge, proposed voir dire, along with a list of 19 unique spellings. So names and terms so that we can give that 20 to our court reporters. 21 Why don't we make that actually the May 1st date. 2.2 It's earlier than I normally get it, but I think it would be 23 nice to get these instructions in particular in advance, and 24 since we do have the luxury of time, we'll do that. 25 If for any reason it becomes problematic, you folks